

RECEIVED

OCT 19 1999

20 MS. SWARTZ: Good evening. My name is
21 Ginger Swartz, and I represent the Office of the
22 Governor, the Nevada Agency for Nuclear
23 Projects. And my responsibility this evening is
24 to present a statement from Robert R. Loux, the
25 executive director of the Nevada Agency for

1 Nuclear Projects.

2 The National Environmental Policy Act
3 process is the primary entree the public has to
4 participate in federal decision-making on actions
5 that may or will significantly affect the
6 environment, including the human environment. The
7 Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended,
8 requires that the Department of Energy issue an
9 environmental impact statement to accompany the
10 recommendation of the -- I'm sorry -- to
11 accompany the recommendation by the Secretary of
12 Energy to the President that the country go
13 forward with development of a high-level nuclear
14 waste repository at Yucca Mountain, if such a
15 recommendation is made.

16 The NEPA procedures are designed to
17 insure that environmental information, including
18 information on the human environment, as well as
19 public health and safety, is available to public
20 officials and citizens before decisions are made
21 and before actions are taken. The purpose of
22 these NEPA regulations is to assure that federal
23 agencies respond according to the letter and
24 spirit of the Act.

25 The program that this particular Draft

1 Environmental Impact Statement is required to
2 address is not just another federal project like
3 a dam or a pier, or even a research facility. The
4 Yucca Mountain program is entirely unprecedented
5 in its scope, its time frame, the geographical
6 area of potential impact that it encompasses, and
7 the fact that it contemplates the concentration
8 of tens of thousands of tons of some of the most
9 toxic and long-lived waste products human society
10 has ever produced in one location.

11 The final EIS must, therefore, address
12 not only the more traditional effects of a large
13 and complex project, such as impacts to the
14 environment, to public health and safety, to area
15 populations and to states and local economies,
16 but the final EIS must also address those impacts
17 of the program which derive from the highly
18 controversial nature of this activity and the
19 fact that the program involves the handling,
20 movement, and storage of nuclear waste materials.

21 This project will impact not only the
22 host state and host community, but also thousands
23 of communities and thousands of citizens located
24 along highways and railways that will be used to
25 ship deadly nuclear materials from the facilities

1 cont'd.

1 where they were generated to the Yucca Mountain
2 repository.

2

3 With respect to Eastern Nevada, the
4 DEIS fails to consider the potential impacts of
5 legal-weight truck shipments of spent nuclear
6 fuel and high-level radioactive waste through
7 Elko and White Pine counties. Studies prepared
8 for the Nevada Department of Transportation have
9 identified Alternate U.S. 93 from West Wendover
10 to Lages Station, U.S. 93 from Lages Station to
11 Ely, U.S. 6 from Ely to Tonopah, and U.S. 95 from
12 Tonopah to Yucca Mountain as a possible route for
13 highly radioactive material shipment.

14 Appendix J of the DEIS identifies this
15 route, the so-called NDOT B Route, as a potential
16 State-designated alternative truck route for
17 truck shipments to the repository. The DOE used
18 portions of this route for truck shipments of
19 spent nuclear fuel from the Nevada Test Site to
20 the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental
21 Laboratory in the 1980s.

22 According to the DEIS, there could be
23 about 49,500 to 96,000 legal-weight truck
24 shipments to the repository under the mostly
25 truck scenario. 90 percent or more of these

1 shipments, or an average of five to ten trucks
2 per day, could travel the NDOT B Route through
3 West Wendover, McGill, and Ely.

3

4 [The draft document fails to consider
5 unique local conditions along the NDOT B Route
6 that could result in significantly higher routine
7 radiological exposures than those calculated by
8 DOE using the RADTRAN 4 computer model.

9 For example, individuals who reside,
10 work, or attend school at certain locations
11 within 20 to 130 feet of a nuclear waste highway
12 could receive exposures in excess of the average
13 annual background radiation dose. DOE has failed
14 to investigate whether such conditions exist near
15 school zones and pedestrian crossings, left-turn
16 lanes and traffic signals, congested
17 intersections and uphill grades in West Wendover,
18 McGill and Ely.]

4

19 [The DEIS also fails to consider unique
20 local conditions along the potential truck route
21 that could cause unacceptable safety and security
22 risks for truck shipments using General Atomics
23 GA-4/9 casks. Primarily a rural, two-lane highway
24 with numerous steep grades and sharp curves, the
25 route traverses high mountain passes subject to

4 cont'd.

1 severe winter storms. Long segments of up to 60
2 miles sometimes have no safe parking areas, few
3 refueling facilities, and limited local emergency
4 response capabilities.

5 The Draft report assumes that almost
6 all truck shipments will be made in the new
7 GA-4/9 casks. The weight of the loaded GA-4/9
8 casks requires that it be used in conjunction
9 with a specially designed trailer, a lower
10 weight, cab-over-engine tractor, and a single
11 fuel tank. The DOE has failed to demonstrate that
12 the GA-4/9 system is appropriately designed for a
13 decade's long, nationwide shipping campaign to
14 Yucca Mountain.

5...

15 The draft EIS fails to consider unique
16 local conditions along the NDOT B Route which may
17 increase the probability of severe accidents, and
18 which could exacerbate the consequences of a
19 severe accident or terrorist attack resulting in
20 a release of radioactive materials.

21 There are numerous mountain passes,
22 such as White Horse Pass, Currant Summit, Black
23 Rock Summit, Sandy Summit, and Warm Springs Pass.
24 Near-route terrain frequently includes drop-offs
25 into deep canyons or river valleys that would

...5

1 make response to an accident or attack, and
2 recovery of the cask, damaged or not, quite
3 difficult.

4 Route proximity to surface water and
5 groundwater resources is a major concern. DOE has
6 failed to address the implications of
7 route-specific conditions for accident
8 prevention, emergency medical response, and the
9 economic costs of cleanup and recovery.

6

10 The DEIS fails to consider unique
11 local conditions along the NDOT B Route which
12 could result in unacceptable socioeconomic
13 impacts. During the past decade, there has been
14 significant demographic and economic growth in
15 and around West Wendover and Ely. Most of the
16 new commercial development, including hotels,
17 casinos, restaurants, and retail sales
18 establishments, has occurred within two miles of
19 the NDOT B Route.

20 The draft EIS ignores the potential
21 adverse impacts of large numbers of spent nuclear
22 fuel on tourism-based economies located near
23 highway routes to Yucca Mountain.
24 State-of-the-art risk studies sponsored by the
25 State of Nevada researchers have documented the

6 cont'd.

1 public perception of risks associated with
2 nuclear waste transportation. DOE has failed to
3 address potential adverse impacts on year-round
4 tourism, seasonal tourism, and special-event
5 tourism, the effects of risk perception on
6 property values along shipping routes, and
7 risk-related impacts on business location and
8 expansion decisions.]

7

9 [Finally, the draft EIS fails to
10 consider transportation impacts on specific
11 Native American communities located in close
12 proximity to potential spent nuclear fuel and
13 high-level radioactive waste routes. In
14 particular, there is no evaluation of possible
15 impacts to the Duckwater Reservation, which is
16 located in proximity to U.S. 6 and the NDOT B
17 Route.]

8

18 The State of Nevada will be submitting
19 extensive written comments on this draft EIS for
20 a high-level nuclear waste repository at Yucca
21 Mountain. [It is our hope that these comments and
22 those of all others will be seriously considered,
23 and that a reasonable no-action alternative, as
24 opposed to the unreasonable and unrealistic ones
25 contained in the draft document, is selected as

8 cont'd.

1 the preferred action in the Final Environmental
2 Impact Statement.]

3 MS. BOOTH: Thank you.

4 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you very much. As I
5 said, Ms. Swartz is the last person that I have
6 on my list. Is there anybody else who would like
7 to speak at this time? Yes, please.